

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8 and 20-25 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 20-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herz et al. (US Patent App. 2001/0014868), in view of Freeny, Jr. (US 6,076,071), and further in view of Kaminsky et al. (2001/0047308). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Herz, Freeny, and Kaminsky teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 20-25.

Claims 1 and 5 are the independent claims.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, “price setting means for determining a dependency element specified for said product from among a plurality of dependency elements, each dependency element associated with a respective price determination policy and a price trend table storing a change condition indicating a current value corresponding to the price determination policy, and the price setting means for dynamically setting a current retail price of said product upon completion of each sale in accordance with the price determination policy and the price trend table associated with said dependency element.” Claim 5 includes substantially similar limitations.

Herz teaches a method for selecting offers that are likely to result in profitable sales based on methods for predicting which offers a current consumer would be likely to accept (see paragraph [0037]). Herz is a user centric system using input relevant to the user including profiles, identity and goals of a shopper (see paragraph [0029-0036]). Herz processes the profile data so as to make customized offers to the current customer (see paragraphs [0003] and [0237]). Herz does not teach or suggest determining a dependency element specified for said product

from among a plurality of dependency elements, each dependency element associated with a respective price determination policy and price trend table, essentially as claimed in Claims 1 and 5. Herz teaches that versions of offers are crafted by an expert system from a plurality of parameters. Herz does not specifically teach how these versions or how the parameters effect the offers. Further, Herz fails to teach the claimed dependency element associated with a respective price determination policy and price trend table. Therefore, Herz fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 1 and 5.

Freeny teaches a product pricing system (see Abstract). Freeny does not teach or suggest “determining a dependency element specified for said product from among a plurality of dependency elements, each dependency element associated with a respective price determination policy and a price trend table” as claimed in Claim 1 and essentially as claimed in Claim 5. Freeny’s product pricing system uses sales and inventory data, pricing and advertising data, and competition price (see col. 3, lines 49-55). Freeny is silent on a dependency element specified for a given product. There is no teaching or suggestion in Freeny of determining a dependency element of a product. Therefore, Freeny fails to cure the deficiencies of Herz.

Kaminsky teaches a system for liquidating inventory using an auction (see Abstract). Kaminsky teaches a pricing strategy having a demand price and a buyer auction scheme (see Abstract), which operates per business rules determined by the particular merchant (see paragraph [0037]) relevant to an auction (i.e., a current price, an open order, demand price and bid price)(see paragraph [0049]). Kaminsky’s rules specify simple parameters for the auction; in any event Kaminsky adjusts a current price only in relation to a bid price. Kaminsky has no need for determining a dependency element, essentially as claimed. Thus, Kaminsky does not teach or suggest “determining a dependency element specified for said product from among a

plurality of dependency elements, each dependency element associated with a respective price determination policy and a price trend table” as claimed in Claim 1 and essentially as claimed in Claim 5. Therefore, Kaminsky fails to cure the deficiencies of Herz.

The combined teachings of Herz and Kaminsky are directed to methods for determining prices in response to an inquiry or bid of a customer. The combined teachings of Herz and Kaminsky do not teach or suggest “determining a dependency element specified for said product from among a plurality of dependency elements, each dependency element associated with a respective price determination policy and a price trend table” as claimed in Claim 1 and essentially as claimed in Claim 5.

Claims 3 and 20-23 depend from Claim 1. Claims 7, 8 and 24-25 depend from Claim 5. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claims 1 and 5. Claims 2 and 6 have been canceled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8 and 20-25, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 19, 2008

By: /Nathaniel T. Wallace/
Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889